

and wholly destitute of sculpture, were found in soundings taken by Capt. Spratt off the coast of Crete. Diam. $\frac{1}{50}$ inch.

EXPLANATION OF THE PLATES.

PLATE VII.

- Fig. 1. *Cythere porcellanea*, seen from left side.
 Fig. 2. The same, seen from above.
 Fig. 3. The same, from below.
 Fig. 4. The same, from the front.
 Fig. 5. *Cythere fuscata*, seen from the left side.
 Fig. 6. The same, seen from above.
 Fig. 7. The same, from below.
 Fig. 8. The same, from the front.
 Fig. 9. *Cythere Stimpsoni*, seen from the left side.
 Fig. 10. The same, from above.
 Fig. 11. The same, from below.
 Fig. 12. The same, from the front.
 Fig. 13. *Cythere affinis*, seen from the left side.
 Fig. 14. The same, seen from above.
 Fig. 15. *Polycope*, sp., seen from the side.
 Fig. 16. The same, end view.
- } × 40.
 } × 60.

PLATE VIII.

- Fig. 1. *Cytheropteron acutum*, seen from the left side.
 Fig. 2. The same, seen from above.
 Fig. 3. The same, seen from below.
 Fig. 4. The same, seen from the front.
 Fig. 5. *Cytherideis teres*, seen from the left side.
 Fig. 6. The same, seen from below.
 Fig. 7. *Pontocypris obtusata*, seen from the left side.
 Fig. 8. The same, seen from above.
 Fig. 9. *Loxoconcha tamarindus* (?), seen from the left side.
 Fig. 10. The same, seen from above.
 Fig. 11. *Loxoconcha tumida*, seen from the left side.
 Fig. 12. The same, seen from above.
 Fig. 13. *Cytherura flavescens*, seen from the left side.
 Fig. 14. The same, from above.
 Fig. 15. The same, seen from the front.
 Fig. 16. *Loxoconcha angustata*, seen from the left side.
 Fig. 17. The same, seen from above.
- } × 40.
 } × 60.
 } × 40.

XII.—*Reply to Dr. E. P. Wright's Observations on Dredging.*

To the Editors of the Annals and Magazine of Natural History.

GENTLEMEN,

The remarks of Dr. Wright, in this month's Number of the 'Annals,' on what he is pleased to term the "accidental" discovery by me of starfishes normally living in the deeper abysses of the ocean, are so far incorrect that I must beg to be permitted to reply to them.

In the first place, I would observe that I accompanied the expedition, in the course of which that discovery was made, with the express purpose of ascertaining if my belief in the existence of animal life at the greatest depths was well founded or the contrary. The capture of any particular genus or order of animals not having been anticipated by me, the capture of the *Ophiocomæ* might, under a strained and perverted interpretation, receive the verdict of "accidental;" or it might be called accidental in the sense that, from that particular locality, that particular sounding, or the instrument employed on that special occasion, no distinct result was looked for. In this sense, but in this sense only, I had myself already described it as being "accidental." I certainly did not expect to capture an *Ophiocoma*, any more than I expected to capture a turbot. If it affords Dr. Wright any satisfaction to learn this, he is welcome to the fact; but since I can adduce the clearest evidence in support of my having anticipated the general scientific result which it was my good fortune to be able to establish, I must say it appears to me that Dr. Wright has gone out of his course, somewhat ungracefully in this instance, to deliver himself of what appears very like a sneer.

Scientific men are quite competent to decide whether a discovery made with a "*sounding-line*" (for which Dr. Wright expresses such contempt) is a discovery of less value than one made with a "*dredge*," and, further, whether the mere circumstance of a set of Echinoderms showing a preference for a piece of sounding-line, when they might have secured an upward passage of a mile and a half within a comfortable copper or iron receptacle, can detract in the slightest degree from the value or the significance of the discovery *when worked out to its legitimate conclusion*.

I would, however, remind Dr. Wright that, whilst he seems so ready to call my discovery "*accidental*," he does not appear to be aware that he has placed in my hands a weapon which recoils somewhat unpleasantly on himself; for he does not hesitate to claim full credit (see 'Annals' for December 1868, p. 426) for having "*added to the fauna of this deep-sea valley [from a depth of 480 fathoms] a shark*" as well as "*a sponge!*" and this in the same page that he naïvely informs your readers that "*he was not prepared to find sharks at such a depth, and was surprised when the padrone asked for leave to throw out the fishing-lines just over the place where they had drawn up the dredge*" from the above-mentioned depth of only 480 fathoms.

As bearing on Dr. Wright's discovery of the shark at 480 fathoms, I may mention that many years ago MM. Pouillet and Biot, from independently conducted observations, were

enabled to prove that fish lived at depths of 500 and 550 fathoms—and, further, to arrive at some really important conclusions regarding the constitution of the gases contained in their swimming-bladders when subsisting under the conditions there present.

Dr. Wright has, moreover, to inform the scientific public on what basis (when referring to my starfish-sounding at 1260 fathoms) he would have us believe that the “dredge” is alone capable of affording “indications of animals higher than the Rhizopods living at those depths” (*loc. cit.*), unless when, *by accident*, that instrument happens to bring one of these “higher animals” to the surface.

Surely, if my discovery was an accident, the discovery of Dr. Wright’s shark was “*an accident of an accident.*”

I remain,

Gentlemen,

Very faithfully, yours,

G. C. WALLICH.

Kensington, December 6, 1868.

XIII.—*Descriptions and Sketches of some new Species of Araneidea, with Characters of a new Genus.* By the Rev. O. P. CAMBRIDGE, M.A.

[Plates IV., V., VI.]

Genus STORENA (Walck.).

This genus was founded in 1805 by Baron Walckenaer (*Tableau des Aranéides*, p. 83, pl. 6. figs. 55, 56) upon a single spider received from New South Wales. Five species from the same region have lately come under my own eye; and of these, descriptions and sketches of characteristic portions of structure are given below.

Storena variegata.

—— *scintillans.*

—— *Bradleyi.*

Storena australiensis.

—— *maculata.*

The last two of these I had at first described as constituting a new genus; afterwards the first two species came under my notice, and in them I recognized at once the exact type of Walckenaer’s description; between these and the last two no generic distinction could be discovered, though each two were the types of a distinct group within the genus; lastly, *S. Bradleyi* came before me, and puzzled me much: incapable of generic separation from *S. australiensis* and *S. maculata*, except in a modified relative position of the eyes, yet by that